

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/586,249 | LINDHOLM ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Motilewa Good-Johnson | 2628 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: non-final

 (1) Motilewa Good-Johnson.

(3) _____.

 (2) Kevin Zilka.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 December 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:


45, 48, 49, 52 and 53

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
Applicant's representative agreed to Examiner's amendment to overcome 101 rejection
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)